



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the *Abrégé*,²⁵ and there are many evidences that would lead one to suspect Italian influence where it cannot be verified. The probability is very strong that Ronsard was familiar with Minturno and Daniello, although he mentions neither by name. To sum up, then, there are certain statements which Ronsard makes which are found only in his Italian predecessors. His restricting the epic to one year could not have been suggested by Aristotle; his discussion of the relationship of historian and poet is not at all similar to Aristotle's, nor is his development of the idea of an organism to be found in the Stagirite.

RALPH C. WILLIAMS.

Ohio State University.

REVIEWS

Edmund Spenser. A Critical Study. By HERBERT ELLSWORTH CORY. Berkeley, University of California Press. 1917. VIII, 478 pp.

Mr. Cory's volume is an important testimony to the large place now held by the poetry of Spenser in the field of American philological scholarship. In his Preface, the author sets forth a two-fold purpose: first, "to come to certain conclusions about Spenser only on the basis of a vast number of experiences of other readers of Spenser in every decade from 1579 to 1917," these conclusions, he thinks, having grown "with a logical and almost biological continuity from many earlier interpretations," and deriving their authority not only from literary criticism, but from hints of method, from facts, and from relevant interpretations gained through the study of modern science. Second, Mr. Cory seeks to relate his study of Spenser to "twentieth-century nationalism, imperialism, feminism, and that socialistic-syndicalistic controversy which is to be the twentieth century version of the old struggle between those who emphasize the social contract and those who emphasize the rights of individuals and of minorities." In working out these purposes Mr. Cory gives a review of the entire corpus of Spenser's poetry, with a digest of Spenser criticism extending to 1917. This digest, in view of the advance in Spenser scholarship

²⁵ *Œuvres*, III, 514, 525, 534, 535; also VI, 450, 454.

in recent years, is of high value despite the lack of an index and the failure to supply a bibliography.

In the course of his review of Spenser's poetry and the work of previous critics, Mr. Cory comes to certain conclusions that require careful examination. The most important of these is a theory of the structure of the *Faerie Queene*. Mr. Cory justly protests against regarding Spenser merely as a dreamer and visionary. He sees substance of thought as well as fancy in the great poem. "No single age," he remarks, "has as yet begun to comprehend the innumerable facets, the myriad flashes of history, and philosophy, poetry and prophecy, in the *Faerie Queene*." As a means to such comprehension, Mr. Cory sets forth two propositions concerning the structure of the poem: first, that it was planned by Spenser to be what Mr. Cory calls "an epic of the future"; and, second, that it reveals a progressive disillusion, causing a "crumbling of the structure" of the poem, and proceeding from the poet's despair because Leicester's death made impossible what the poet had hoped for, a union of Leicester and the Queen and an epoch of national greatness which, in Mr. Cory's thought, Spenser foresaw if this union had taken place.

The first of these propositions leads Mr. Cory to the hypothesis that Spenser proposed to "overgo" Ariosto, not by writing a better poem in the same kind, but by inventing an entirely new type. To him, we are told, "came a vision so audacious that even his warmest admirers have not yet comprehended it: a vision to write an epic which would make history through the great light of a cloudy allegory fairly incandescent with prophetic convictions, an epic not of the past but of the future" (p. 53). Mr. Cory repeats this idea at various places: the *Faerie Queene* was to be "a new epic type, an heroic poem whose main theme set forth the great national achievements of the future"; "a new epic type that turns from the old mode of remembering and exalting the past to foreshadowing the future"; he "would write history before it was made in fact"; its secret is in "its superb arrogation of omniscience"; it was to be "an epic of the absolute future, not to celebrate history but to make it" (pp. 55, 56, 58).

Now if one could accept Mr. Cory's theory it would indeed, as he says, "reveal depths in the *Faerie Queene* sufficient to allure even the most casual readers." But the evidence that Mr. Cory brings in support of his contention is both inconsiderable and

unsatisfactory. If we could interpret his phrase "epic of the future" as meaning merely that Spenser aligned himself with the progressives at Elizabeth's court, advising continued war on Spain, bold advocacy of a militant Protestantism, the establishment of a strong navy, and the building of an imperial domain overseas, we should have some grounds for agreement. But the part of the poem in which Spenser comes nearest to advocating such a program is the fifth book, which belongs to what Mr. Cory calls the period of disillusion when the poet had given up his dream of an Elizabethan Utopia. Spenser *was* a progressive; he contended all his life against the cautious policy of Burghley; he was in sympathy, successively, with Leicester, Sidney, Essex, and Raleigh; but Mr. Cory makes small use of this political idealism, and even if he had pressed the point it would not have explained the phrase in the sense in which Mr. Cory uses it. In fact, Mr. Cory has no sympathy with the "ruthless imperialism" of Book V, and his characterization of that book, far from supporting his theory, militates against it (p. 290).

Other evidence drawn from the poem there is none, except for his reference to the first book, on which Mr. Cory remarks that he believes, "calling the *Faerie Queene* as I do an epic of the future which sought to prophesy history, that Spenser intended merely to voice a personal and a popular English fear of the danger of leaving Una (Truth) to be the paramour (sic) of Duessa (Falsehood, Mary Queen of Scots), who would lead St. George to be the prey of Orgoglio (the Catholic church) (p. 78).

Mr. Cory's whole cause, therefore, rests on mere conjecture, except for the use he makes of the idea, familiar since Upton's time, that in Prince Arthur Spenser meant to portray Leicester and that the purpose of the poem as originally conceived was to celebrate the hoped-for marriage between Leicester and the Queen. The suggestion of this marriage, Mr. Cory thinks, the poet put forward "with Parthian reticence." He quotes from the letter to Raleigh Spenser's statement of his intention, if the first twelve books should be well received, to write a second series of twelve books, dealing with the history of Arthur as king, on which Mr. Cory remarks: "He was, if these twelve books were 'well-accepted,' and if Arthur and Gloriana were married, to write an epic sequel celebrating the deeds of Leicester as king-consort or, perhaps,

boldly prophesying for Leicester and Elizabeth the ways that they should follow to be illustrious" (p. 56).

Now, although it is quite possible that in the courtship of Gloriana by Prince Arthur Spenser may have had in mind, at times, Leicester's long ambition, there is no reason whatever to suppose that the poem had for one of its purposes either prophecy of a union between the two or poetical propaganda to bring such a union to pass. For one thing, Spenser's explanation of his general intention in the *Faerie Queene*, given in his letter to Raleigh (dated 23 January, 1589), could not have been written until after Leicester's death, after all thought of a marriage had been abandoned for many years, and after Spenser's bitter complaint about Leicester's abandonment of him had been expressed in *Virgils Gnat*. Mr. Cory's conjecture about the nature of the second twelve books is thus by a simple matter of chronology untenable. Furthermore, the only place in the *Faerie Queene* where Arthur may plausibly be identified as Leicester is in the fifth book, and even this identification is rendered uncertain by the fact that the Arthur of Book V frees Belgae, while Leicester assuredly did not settle the problem at all, but rather was called ignominiously home. The pitfalls that lurk in the path of any one who applies too rigidly any scheme of identification of the personages in the poem may be seen if we consider what the poet does with his personifications of Elizabeth. We know, for example, from the letter to Raleigh that he shadows forth the Queen not only in Gloriana but also in Belpheobe. We also know that Mercilla represents Elizabeth, and Britomart. Now Britomart and Artegal are lovers, and Artegal, part of the time at least, is Lord Grey. Does this prove that Spenser contemplated a marriage between Grey and his Queen? The fact is that the union between Artegal and Britomart symbolizes the union between British justice and the might of Britain in war. At a given moment the course of British justice is made concrete in the course of Lord Grey in Ireland. Artegal, *for this moment*, is Lord Grey. It is the same with the identifications of other major characters. The union of Arthur and Gloriana symbolizes the restoration of the old British line, through the Tudor family, to the supreme power in England.¹ A cardinal

¹ I have discussed this point at some length in an article on "Spenser's Fairy Mythology," *Studies in Philology*, April, 1918.

principle of Spenser's political philosophy was that this new Britain ought to crush the growing menace of Spain. To do this, not only must Ireland be freed from Philip's propaganda, but the Low Countries must be given their liberty. The Queen, half-heartedly, aided the Low Countries, and at one time Leicester was in command of an expeditionary force there. *For this moment*, therefore, Arthur, representing Britain, becomes concrete, personalized, in Leicester. It is no more necessary to believe that Arthur is *always* Leicester than it is to believe that Artegal is always Grey. It is not necessary, therefore, to any one familiar with Spenser's methods in allegory, to suppose that the union between Arthur and Gloriana, the union between England and the old British line, meant to Spenser any actual marriage of the Queen to Leicester or to anyone else. And even if he had begun the composition of his poem with any such idea, it was obviously impossible at the time when the letter to Raleigh was written, and there are no traces of it remaining in the poem itself.

Finally, the dedicatory letter, far from suggesting that Spenser contemplated a second poem of twelve books celebrating the deeds of Leicester as king-consort or at least pointing out the path which the royal pair should follow, is in reality to be explained on quite other grounds. Spenser himself is explicit as to his intention. He says that Homer, in the persons of Agamemnon and Ulysses, had portrayed a good governor and a virtuous man; that Virgil had combined the private and public virtues in the person of Æneas, and Ariosto in his Orlando; Tasso, he says, separated the two sets of virtues, public and private, in his Rinaldo and Godfredo. Following these illustrious examples, Spenser proposes, in the first twelve books, to deal with the twelve private virtues; if these books are well received he will continue with an exposition of kingship. There is, therefore, no basis for any conjecture about an "epic of the future," devoted to Leicester's deeds as king-consort, just as it is impossible to construct out of the adventures of Arthur in the first six books, except for the expedition to the Low Countries, any history of Leicester as king-consort-elect. An epic of Britain, glorifying the reigning house, and containing, according to the poetical theory of the time, an exposition of perfect courtiership, was the object of Spenser's endeavor; herein lies the explanation of the structure of the poem.

The second proposition on which Mr. Cory's theory of the struc-

ture of the *Faerie Queene* rests is closely related to the first. It is that Spenser's plans for writing an epic of the future, giving firm foundation for the first two books of the poem, were dissipated by the death of Leicester, resulting in the third book in a certain confusion and uncertainty, while Books IV-VI became chaotic, the work of "a bewildered and a bitter hand" (p. 160). To quote Mr. Cory:

The fact that Spenser's hero (Leicester not Sidney) died, probably before Spenser had completed his third book, must have been to a hero-worshipper so sincere, the most deadly of destructive influences. The third book shows many signs of confusion. The fourth book is chaos. The fifth book, as an isolated poem, is better, but its strands are not well-woven into the poem as a whole. The sixth book is almost completely disjointed and closes with a bitter anticlimax.

This theory underlies everything that Mr. Cory presents throughout his long analysis of the poem, and indeed all that he presents on the relations of other poems, such as the *Complaints*, to Spenser's life. The value of Mr. Cory's book, therefore, depends in a large sense upon the soundness of this interpretation. After Leicester's death, Mr. Cory contends (p. 64):

Reality refused to pour itself into Spenser's mighty mould for an epic of the future. The break-up of the vast structure of the poem itself, the increase of the casual and the episodical, the influx of chaos, the cry of despair in the last stanzas of the sixth book were inevitable.

After "the unfaltering conviction of the first book" and "the architectonic strength and continuity" displayed in it and in Book II, "he lost his grip"; in Books III and IV "we have an almost complete crumbling of the general structure accompanied with a series of personages taken mainly from romance and often with no allegory whatsoever" (pp. 64, 85, 144, 145). The reason Mr. Cory finds in the death of Leicester, which he thinks took place before Spenser had proceeded very far with the third book. It is impossible to illustrate the many ways in which this theory affects Mr. Cory's judgment even of episodes in the poem; such, for example, as his idea that Arthur fails to take any part in the main action of Book III because Leicester was dead,—“Surely here is our reason. England was failing to become Utopia. Leicester

was dead before the rich materials of the third book had been resolved into the intricate harmonies of which Spenser dreamed."²

Mr. Cory's method is the method of repeated assertion. Of positive argument he gives very little. At times he seems to think that there is proof of the crumbling of the structure of the poem in the fact that after the first two books the allegory is less sustained, appearing only fitfully if at all. But this is not proof of a crumbling structure; it is evidence of a change in Spenser's conception of his poem, an improvement on the whole, and due in large part to the difference between the virtues that form the subject of the third, fourth, and sixth books and the virtues of the other books. "Holiness" is mediæval; "Temperance" is partly mediæval, partly classical; "Justice" is classical; while "Chastity" (Love), "Friendship," and "Courtesy" are treated by Spenser chiefly in the manner of the Renaissance. Book I has the precise and formal structure of mediæval allegory. It is an exceedingly effective complex of the morality play and the Arthurian romance. The pleasure that it gives is in part due to this sense of form. Book IV, on the other hand, is like Sidney's *Arcadia*, which was regarded, at the time when Spenser was writing, as a sublime poem.³ This story of Calidore is romance of the new Renaissance type. The allegory in it is the allegory that the Elizabethans found in *Cyropaedia* or *Arcadia*. To say that because Book IV lacks the formal excellence of Book I therefore the "vast structure" of the epic was "crumbling" is like finding fault with *Cymbeline* or the *Winter's Tale* because they do not have the academic symmetry of structure of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

Mr. Cory seems troubled, also, by the number of unpleasant people one meets in Spenser's poem. These people, with their stories, seem to him not to be brought into close relations with the main plots in the later books. As we go on, he says, we come across many figures "so small, so sordid, we feel that they are drawn by

² P. 147. Even the change in the last stanzas of Book III in the edition of 1596 is due, Mr. Cory thinks, not merely to Spenser's desire to extend Britomart's story into the following book, but "we may be equally sure that his growing disillusion, his growing fear that England was not to become a Utopia, impelled him to close his first symphony on a desolate unresolved chord" (p. 170).

³ For a summary of this theory and its relations to Spenser see "Sidney's 'Arcadia' as an Example of Elizabethan Allegory," in *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, 1913, pp. 327 ff.

a bewildered and a bitter hand" (p. 160). Now this idea, which Mr. Cory returns to again and again, betrays a serious misconception of the very essence of Spenser's method. This method, which is very similar to the use of the *exemplum* by mediæval writers, springs from the conception of poetry held by Spenser and his contemporaries. It is philosophy teaching by example, more gracious than by rule.

Fundamentally, Spenser uses the technique of the Arthurian romances, especially in the first three books. The damsel in distress of Book I; the complaint, in Book II, of the Palmer in behalf of the infant with bloody hands; the groom in Book III with his plea for a champion to rescue the damsel from Busirane—these are familiar romance motifs. Likewise, the interference of Arthur is not merely designed to show that no one virtue is sufficient unto itself; it is an application of the thoroughly conventional motif of the greatest knight in the world, coming to the aid of the knight who is the titular hero of the story. Even in Book III Arthur's failure to appear is not due, as Mr. Cory imagines, to Spenser's disappointment over the death of Leicester, but to the fact that Britomart is in a sense Arthur's equal, the feminine counterpart of that for which Arthur stands. Book III is complementary to Book II. In the story of Guyon the classical ideal of Temperance is exalted. Guyon is sorely tried, but in the end destroys Acrasia, who typifies the hedonistic conception of life implied in Marlowe's conflict between the passion for beauty and the consciousness of sin. Alma, in whom we see, as the editor of the Oxford Spenser has observed, "the soul in perfect command over the body," prepares Guyon to resist the earthly Venus. But in Britomart we have a deeper and warmer conception. She is not, like Guyon, a man struggling for perfection; she is love itself, in whose presence Busirane is as powerless as Comus in the presence of the Lady. She is allegorical in the Platonic, not the mediæval sense. But she also corresponds to Arthur and achieves the triumph appropriate to the greatest knight in the world. Her book, therefore, is closely linked to the two preceding books, while it looks forward, in its stress on the religion of love and beauty, to Book IV.

This method of plot-making becomes even clearer when we consider that Spenser drew his conception of his great knights from the romances. To give but a few of many examples that will instantly occur to the reader, already in *Amis and Amiloun* we

have the virtue of friendship, prototype of Spenser's Cambell and Triamond; Sir Cliges is the embodiment of charity, Isumbras of humility, Sir Gawain of courtesy; the Squire of Low Degree typifies merit and virtue in humble position, ever a favorite theme with Spenser. Thus Red Cross, Guyon, Britomart, Calidore, Artegal, are not mere abstractions, such as one finds in the *Passeytyme of Pleasure* or in *Magnifycence*; they are conceived in the spirit of the romances. To try Spenser, therefore, as Mr. Cory does, by narrow canons of formal allegory; to complain because the later books are free from the scholastic categories of the first book; to say that because the framework is less palpable therefore Spenser was losing his grip, was allowing the structure of his poem to crumble, was inhibited by despair, is singularly to miss the soul of the *Faerie Queene*.

The second observation I would make is that Spenser, following the later Arthurian romances, uses romance situations as *symbols* of spiritual matters. Thus, in *Rigomer*, a girl appears at Arthur's court and calls for a knight. Lancelot goes with her and finds in Ireland an enchanted castle where is a girl who will marry only the best knight in the world. Lancelot fights the monster serpent but can not complete the adventure, until Gawain, like Spenser's Arthur, comes and releases the people in the castle from enchantment. Now here is a primitive situation, without symbolism. But in Chrétien the same situation becomes symbolic, and in Spenser's first book it supplies the framework of the plot. To take a variant, Galahad's rescue of the maidens in the *High History* represents Christ's freeing of the Christian graces from the Seven Deadly Sins, an incident that Spenser transfers bodily to his story of the siege of Alma's castle. Thus Spenser does not copy literally the romances; he uses romance situations as symbols; he uses this method constantly, not occasionally or fortuitously; the episodes of which Mr. Cory and others have complained are of the essence of his method; the increase in this element as he gets away from the morality play structure of Book I is not a proof of failing inspiration but an ever-varying source of new interest. In Caxton's remarks about Malory's Arthur we find one of the chief clues to the method:

Herein may be seen noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendliness, hardiness, love, friendship, cowardice, murder, hate, virtue and sin. Do after the good and leave the evil. . . . All is written

for our doctrine, and for to beware that we fall not to vice nor sin, but *to exercise and follow virtue*.

Finally, the use of the episodes, which as Mr. Cory observes become increasingly noticeable as we go on in the poem, is closely related to this conception of romance situation as symbol. In Guyon's book, for example, an episode like that of Phaedria symbolizes the classical excess, which results in intemperance. In the third and fourth books, where the Renaissance religion of love is the theme, the episodes either exemplify the virtues, to be emulated, or they are sins against love, to be shunned. Especially in the fourth book is the virtue of friendship presented by showing what it is *not*. Hence these spiteful and petty figures that give Mr. Cory so much pain are essential to Spenser's plan, not signs of incoherence and disillusion. In Artegal's book this use of the *exemplum* forms the heart of the structure. Spenser's purpose is to show the defects of the vacillating policy of the government with respect to Ireland. The murdered lady represents the spirit of lawlessness; the episode of the Saracen and his daughter is an *exemplum* showing the evils of bribery. The giant with scales shows the futility of communism, a species of injustice, the negative or obverse of the virtue to which the book is dedicated. Braggadocchio figures as a cowardly boaster who steals the credit that belongs to others. The story of the two brothers is a defense of the imperial policy; while the Radigund episode, which is very similar to an episode in the old romance of *Rigomer*, is a satire on womanish methods of dealing with the Irish problem.

There are no better illustrations of the relation of this method to Spenser's idea of structure than are found in Book VI, which Mr. Cory regards as marking the utter disillusion of Spenser and the chaos that had descended upon his poem. It is the Book of Courtesy. The stress is on the lowly life, or life away from the artificiality and tinsel glitter of the court. The mood is that of *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*. The method, as in Book V, is cumulative, leading directly to the great scenes of Calidore's life among the shepherds. Calepine, Tristram, Aladine, though noble, seem to be men of base origin, outside the group of great knights. The savage man, also of noble blood, is more truly courteous than others. The hermit has left the court, like the Duke in Shakespeare's drama. Indeed, the whole atmosphere of the book, as I have pointed out elsewhere, is that of plays like *As You Like It*,

Cymbeline, and *Winter's Tale*.⁴ The climax is in the story of Melibœus and the pastoral of Calidore and his love. It is not bitter. It has no more of disillusion than comes to any man who has attained years enough and wisdom enough to distinguish between the shows of things and reality. To postulate despair and chaos in mind and structure is critical blindness. It is to miss the ripeness, the wisdom, the charm, of poetry that has welded life and verse into imperishable harmonies. It is to prefer the glitter of *Love's Labour's Lost* to the maturity of the *Tempest*. What is far worse, for a student of literary history, it is to miss the fascination which the contemplative life exerted over the finest minds of that time of action, the Renaissance. It is to deal falsely, not only with Spenser, but with the mind of his age.

The key to the fallacy in Mr. Cory's interpretation is to be found, I believe, in the sentence from his Preface quoted at the beginning of this review, to the effect that his conclusions have grown "with a logical and almost biological continuity from many earlier interpretations." His entire theory is based, apparently, upon Dryden's remark, quoted on page 59, that "Prince Arthur, or his chief patron, Sir Philip Sidney, whom he intended to make happy by the marriage of his Gloriana, dying before him, deprived the poet both of the means and spirit to accomplish his design." For Sidney Mr. Cory substitutes Leicester, a suggestion that is as old as Upton; accepts, in effect, the old quarrel of the eighteenth century critics about the unity of the poem, modified somewhat by the view current in recent times that the *Faerie Queene* is but "the fragment of a splendid and incoherent design";⁵ and finds a new explanation for the "breakdown" by following out Dryden's ingenious but utterly wrong-headed assertion about the inhibition produced upon Spenser by the death of his "hero." In accordance with this theory Mr. Cory explains the publication of the *Complaints* volume in 1591, neglecting the obvious fact that a collection of juvenilia by a poet who had just scored an emphatic success was a good business proposition, and also neglecting the testimony of *Colin Clout*, to say nothing of the fifth book of the epic. Given this hypothesis, Mr. Cory can see in the later books of the *Faerie Queene* only that

⁴ "Shakespeare's Pastorals," *Studies in Philology*, April, 1916.

⁵ Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, II, p. 3.

The building of Utopias became necessarily less and less easy, and many of his cloudy symbols must have become for him strange mocking runes written in wandering fires . . . the allegory . . . but enigmatic gropings. . . . The political allegory is hopelessly episodic, the moral allegory is capricious and, when vital, almost invariably bitter. At the same time the capricious and almost meaningless romances which we saw increasing in the third book grow more and more numerous and elaborate and confusing" (p. 256; cf. also p. 331).

Mr. Cory's conclusions thus grow, indeed, with biological continuity from the observations of previous critics. His method is fundamentally the method of certain eighteenth century critics of the great Elizabethans—a sincere but often impressionistic appreciation of the "beauties" of the poet, held in check by the application of conventional tests of unity, and, in this case, by the presence or absence of that formalism contributed by the allegory. In Mr. Cory's book the two types of comment, the "beauties" and the form, are coördinated; he does not grapple with the problems presented by the *Faerie Queene* as a whole, or even with those presented by a single book; he applies his test of disillusion and approaching chaos in structure, and then quotes passage after passage with the enthusiasm of a lover of poetry who has forgotten every standard in abandonment to his own enjoyment. To such familiar debates in eighteenth century criticism as the question whether Shakespeare knew or did not know the ancients, or whether *Paradise Lost* fulfills the requirements of the classical epic or not, there succeeds, in Mr. Cory, the hypothesis that the failure of the *Faerie Queene* to measure up to the pseudo-classical formalism is due to the poet's bitter disappointment over the course of English history. That is, the pseudo-classic tests have grown, by biological continuity perhaps, into the romantic method of Dowden's *Shakespeare*. And this romanticism, manifested in the lack of concreteness, the substitution of assertion for argument or fact, and the wholly sentimental view he holds of Spenser's mind, is but thinly disguised by the frequent references to social movements, labor unrest, woman suffrage, contemporary literature, and the like.

On that large part of the book which is made up of selections of noble numbers from the great poem, with the enthusiastic and often penetrating comments which the author adds to justify his selection, there is here no space for comment. It is sufficient to

say that here is God's plenty, and that Mr. Cory deserves hearty appreciation for opening, more fully than one finds in any previous book on Spenser, the riches in the later portions of the epic. Most essays of Mr. Cory's school, from Macaulay on, give the impression that a few early cantos sufficed the critics, who did not really care to find out whether the Blatant Beast met death or not. The charge cannot be brought against Mr. Cory. He has read every line, and his quotations and his comments send us to the poem. In every age we shall need this personal appraisal, the record of adventures among books. But for our interpretation of the work of a great poet as a whole, we shall need to avoid biological analogies, the idea that to-day's criticism is from the same root as Dryden's or Upton's or Lowell's, and to use the method of history and science instead.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

The University of North Carolina.

Molière, Le Tartuffe ou l'Imposteur. Edited with introduction and notes by BERT EDWARD YOUNG. New York: Oxford University Press, 1918. xcii + 118 pp.

Good editions of this masterpiece, so indispensable to all students of the French drama, have not been lacking—one need only mention, for instance, the texts edited by such American scholars as Professor C. H. C. Wright and Professor J. E. Matzke. Hence, to call for special comment, a new contribution to the list must possess particular merit. This, it seems to the writer, is precisely the case with the book of Professor Young. The fruit of long and patient research, comprising not only a study of the best commentators, but also reference to original and infrequently seen contemporary works, his introduction and notes offer American students the most accessible material for a thorough study of the play in all its bearings of which the reviewer has any knowledge.

Exception might be taken—for no edition can please every one—to the very summary fashion in which the facts of Molière's life are relegated to a brief statement in the notes. No mention is even made here of the poet's unhappy marriage, which, in the judgment of many, profoundly affected his work. References are, however, given to the important biographies of the dramatist, and it is